DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 118 170 JC 760 096

AUTHOR Shaw, Frances Fergusson
TITLE Analysis of California Community College District Policies of Faculty Teaching Load.
PUB DATE Aug 75
NOTE 61p.; M.A. Thesis, California State University, Los Angeles

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; General Education; *Junior Colleges; Literature Reviews; *State Surveys; *Teaching Load; Vocational Education Teachers; Working Hours
IDENTIFIERS California

ABSTRACT

California community colleges assign teaching loads according to district policy. In order to identify prevalent standards for assigning teaching loads, a survey by mail of 102 California community colleges was conducted. Responses were received from 73 institutions (72 percent). Although a survey of the literature reveals that a 15-clock hour load is considered optimal, and the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office supports this standard, many deviations from this norm were found. In such disciplines as English, foreign language, and other academic areas, faculty had clearly defined patterns of assignment, from 15 to 20 hours. The most inconsistencies were found in occupational education instructors' assignments, with hours ranging from 14 to 35 per week. On the basis of the review of the literature and an analysis of the survey results, a number of conclusions are drawn, and two recommendations are made: (1) State agencies and academic departments should establish and maintain realistic proposals of expected teaching loads; (2) Continuous assessment should be done regarding correlation of faculty teaching loads in each discipline. Survey results are tabulated in the body of the paper, and the survey instrument and list of respondents are appended. (Author/NHM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED118170

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ANALYSIS OF CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT POLICIES OF FACULTY TEACHING LOAD

A Thesis

Presented to

the Faculty of the Department of Industrial Studies

California State University, Los Angeles

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

---

by

Frances Fergusson Shaw

August 1975

JC 760 096

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES v

Chapter

1. THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED 1

INTRODUCTION 1

THE PROBLEM 2

Statement of the Problem 2

Purpose of the Study 3

Need for the Study 3

Limitations of the Study 4

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED 5

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY 6

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND RELATED RESEARCH . 7

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT 7

Initial Two-year Private College Period (1835?-1900) 8

Initial Two-year Public College Period (1901-1920) 8

Period of Expanding Occupational Programs (1921-1947) 9

Period of the Comprehensive Community College (1948-) 10

Legislative Status of Community College in 1965 12

Chapter Page

MAJOR CONTRIBUTIONS IN PREVIOUS RESEARCH 13

SUMMARY 18

3. THE PROCEDURE 20

SELECTION OF CONTROL GROUP STUDIED 20

POPULATION INFORMATION 21

DEVELOPMENT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE 21

ADMINISTRATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE . . . 24

SUMMARY 25

4. RESULTS 26

STANDARD TEACHING LOAD 27

Occupational Education Instructors . . . 27

Lecture/Nonlecture Combination Loads . . 31

Physical Science Instructors 34

AVAILABILITY OF SURVEY DATA TO RESPONDENTS 37

5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . 39

SUMMARY 39

CONCLUSIONS 41

RECOMMENDATIONS 42

BIBLIOGRAPHY 43

APPENDIXES 45

A. Questionnaire 46

B. Follow-up Letter 48

Appendixes Page

C. Method of Response 50

D. Respondents to Questionnaire 53

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Standard Teaching Load	28
2.	Physical Education Instructors	29
3.	Business Education Instructors	30
4.	Clock Hours Stated as Guideline for Instructors Who Have Laboratory, Studio, Performance, or Other Classes Which Are NOT Considered Lecture in Nature	31
5.	Ratio Used in Computation of Lecture/ Nonlecture and/or Laboratory Hours	32
6.	Instructors Conducting English Composition Classes	33
7.	Scheduling for Foreign Language Instructors .	34
8.	Present Assigned Clock Hours for Other Academic Faculty not Included in Study thus Far	35
9.	Physical Science Instructors	35
10.	Adjusted (or Reduced) Instructor Schedule to Compensate for Heavy Course Load Indicating Methods Used by Respondents . . .	38

Chapter 1

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

INTRODUCTION

The California community college instructor is facing the same basic problem that is besetting individuals throughout the present social order, namely the necessity of adapting to situations resulting from varying conditions of employment and the need to adapt to continuous institutional changes.

Questions regarding instructor scheduling are continually asked regarding the existence of a correlation of assigned teaching loads throughout the California community college system.

Attention to the areas of skills, attitudes, and application of knowledge to the teaching process presents a demanding need for evaluation of the assignment or scheduling of faculty members to best utilize the abilities of each. It cannot be denied that educational reforms can provide a more meaningful educational climate.

The design of this study was based on a select group of subjects throughout the California community college system in order to determine whether a correlation

can be found in order to compare the results at the conclusion of the study.

THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem

In recent years, there has been increasing concern on the part of community college instructors relative to the clock hours assigned them in comparison to those in surrounding districts. Variables are also present when comparisons are made with those teaching in disciplines other than the areas in which each individual is involved.

The problem is many times aggravated when instructors become aware that long hours assigned in classroom and/or laboratory prohibits professional growth. Academic instructors feel that study time is limited, while occupational education instructors find themselves unable to keep current with industry standards and methods of operation of newly developed advances in technology.

The problem of this study was: (1) to examine the assigned instructor clock hours at selected community colleges in California, listing subject matter taught; (2) to determine methods of modifying schedules when necessary; as well as (3) to provide assistance in establishing standards through fostering further research. This study was not concerned with instructional teaching

quality.

Purpose of the Study

It was the purpose of this research to survey the presently functioning faculty assignments throughout the California community college system. To this end, answers were sought to the following questions:

1. What suggestions are offered in literature concerning clock hours taught at the community college level?

2. What standardization is presently in existence for use in assigning teaching loads?

3. What guidelines can be developed for standardization of teaching loads in community colleges?

4. What recommendations can be made for improving clock hours at the community college?

Need for the Study

A basic factor in planning faculty teaching assignments is the relative desirability of their work. In addition to a total teaching load, the attractiveness of a position may also be based on salary, extra duties, sick leave, tenure, and other benefits. Stable levels of expectancy should be attempted, even though no national data are available for comparison in several of these areas, in others fairly definite information has been

provided.

As far back as 1939, Conley studied the junior college instructor and discovered certain facts about his work load that are still reasonably accurate, as confirmed by a limited questionnaire distributed to 1150 instructors in fifteen instructional departments, including only those public junior colleges that employed more than 15 instructors.[1]

Expanded enrollments and enlarged program offerings using extensive facilities and resources should reflect adequate planning of instructional time.

Limitations of the Study

This study was conducted in view of the following limitations:

1. Survey letters had to be prepared in a limited time in order to expect adequate response.

2. Questionnaire response would require a minimum of effort.

3. Wording of questions must be easily understood by all those surveyed.

4. Questions were gathered to collect data about selected disciplines.

---

[1]James W. Thornton, Jr., The Community Junior College (2d ed.; New York: John Wiley, 1966), p. 138.

5. Answers to questions would be reported in a way amenable to accurate computation, analysis, and interpretation.

6. Each of the 102 (as of summer, 1975) community colleges in California had to be researched to determine the name of the instructional deans in order to contact each personally to expect larger response.

7. This instrument was designed for the purpose of providing a sound basis for future programming.

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

The following terms are defined as used in this study.

Clock hours. This term refers to the actual number of hours spent by each instructor in assigned teaching, whether it be lecture or laboratory and/or shop.

Community college. A community college is an institution of higher learning, controlled by a local board of trustees or regents and operated under statutory provisions. Two or more years of work in one or more standard collegiate academic curriculum are offered, but one or more years of instruction may be offered which are terminal in nature. A community college may confer the associate degree, but it does not grant the baccalaureate

degree.

Standard teaching load. This term refers to a report by the California State Chancellor's Office that standard teaching load is generally felt to be equated to fifteen lecture hours per week.

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter 1 has presented the problem and its importance, including an introduction, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, need for the study, and limitations of the study. Terms central to the study were defined.

Chapter 2 contains a review of related literature, including literature and major contributions (made) to the problem, and includes a brief overview of community college development.

Chapter 3 deals with the development of the questionnaire and refers to population studied.

Chapter 4 provides the survey and acquisition of materials gathered from selected deans of the California community colleges and includes treatment of data gathered.

Chapter 5 summarizes and concludes the study.

A bibliography and appendixes provide appropriate reference to the text of the study.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND RELATED RESEARCH

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

Unifying forces contributing to the present status of the community college are numerous and varied, of which four major forces seem to stand out. The first force was the establishment of the idea itself, proposed by a succession of deans and university presidents; the second force involved the economic wherewithal for community college development in a nation that was rapidly becoming the wealthiest in the history of the world. A third force was the practical feasibility of integrating the idea, i.e., the ease with which the community college machinery could be set in motion. Finally, the fourth force was the public's acceptance of the idea of providing an easy access to higher education for all those who desired it and could profit by it. Therefore, the idea, the wealth, the practicability, and the democratic dream were the major forces interacting to produce the phenomenon of the American two-year college. While the divisions of this phenomenon vary with the writers on the subject, at least

four stages can be clearly identified.[1]

Initial Two-year Private College Period (1835?-1900)

Kelley and Wilbur noted,

> The private junior college was the first type to be founded in the United States. The word initial is used in the heading because the greatest thrust of growth, as in the case of all other types, came after 1900.[2]

Initial Two-year Public College Period (1901-1920)

Of course, the groundwork for the beginning of the two-year public college in the United States was laid by the results of the private junior colleges and the actions taken by the various educational leaders before 1900. The greatest advances toward the eventual public community college probably occurred from 1883 to 1900.[3]

Institutes, including such types as technical and military, also began their rise before 1920; one example being the New Mexico Military Institute, founded in 1915.

---

[1]Jesse P. Bogue, The Community College (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1950), p. 6.

[2]Win Kelley and Leslie Wilbur, Teaching in the Community Junior College (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970), pp. 5-6.

[3]Ibid., p. 6.

Various federal grants in the area of vocational-technical education fostered the growth of institutes as well as specialized programs in the other more general colleges.

> Also fostering growth during this period was the starting of an associate in arts degree for junior college graduates who had completed certain required courses and programs.[4]

Period of Expanding Occupational Programs (1921-1947)

It is natural that community colleges emphasized collegiate course of a transfer nature prior to 1921. These courses were in greatest demand. Also, these early colleges were quite often very small--many of them enrolled less than 100 students--therefore, they lacked the size and financial backing for the so-called "terminal" programs. However, the idea of occupational programs received noticeable increasing support from 1921 to 1947. It is interesting to note the comparison of growth of the community colleges in direct proportion to the number of occupational programs established in both the older and newly founded institutions.[5]

---

[4]Kelley and Wilbur, Teaching in the Community Junior College, pp. 12-13.

[5]Ibid., p. 14.

Period of the Comprehensive Community College (1948--)

> Like the other dates mentioned to identify the stages of community college evolution, 1948 is somewhat arbitrary; and yet this particular year was selected logically. In 1948 at least three significant events fostered the identifying caption, the comprehensive community college.

Kelley and Wilbur indicated that the first event in that year was the report of the President's Commission on Higher Education for American Democracy. The report stated:

> "The time has come to make education through the fourteenth grade available in the same way that high school education is available."

The report was released beginning in December, 1947, through February, 1948; and was issued in six volumes. The Commission proposed that free public education should be extended upward to include two more years of study beyond high school and that every state should establish local community colleges as a part of the public school system so that every person would have easy access to free education through the sophomore year.

The second event in that year was New York's establishment of "one of the most comprehensive laws ever enacted for the establishment of a state-wide system and was the first state to designate these institutions as community colleges." Even the idea and name--community college--had been discussed and written about several years prior to New York's action, however. The Commission on

Terminal Education, in 1940, listed the community college as essentially a community institution. Furthermore, the President's Commission used the term community college in its report of 1947-48. New York, however, paved the way through legislation toward the reality of a comprehensive community college system followed by other states in the years later.

A third event which had national implication occurred in California, which along with New York seems to have set many of the standards in community college growth and development. Almost from the beginning of its community college establishment (occurring in 1910), California led the nation in the rapid expansion of community college campuses. As mentioned previously, California had the nation's first community college state law in 1907. From then on, other states watched California with great interest and possibly looked for guidance in the development of their community college program. The situation was no different even in 1948, when the state then had established fifty-five community colleges. Later, in 1969, the junior college directory noted that California had the largest number of institutions--ninety--and the number has currently reached over one hundred.[6]

---

[6]Kelley and Wilbur, Teaching in the Community Junior College, pp. 14-16.

Legislative Status of Community College in 1965

In most of the states, the constitutionality of the public junior college is implied rather than expressed. Thus, as Simms pointed out, "under Amendment X to the United States Constitution, the responsibility for public schools, having been neither "delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States," is reserved to the states respectively or to the people. Under this power, only California has made express constitutional provision for junior colleges.[7]

The legislative definition of the public community college should be sufficiently broad to enable the responsible local and state authorities to develop the patterns of post-high-school education that will satisfy the developing needs of their communities.[8]

---

[7]Charles Wesley Simms, The Present Legal Status of the Public Junior College (Nashville, Tenn.: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1948), p. 14.

[8]James W. Thornton, Jr., The Community Junior College (2d ed.; New York: James Wiley, 1966), p. 92.

MAJOR CONTRIBUTIONS IN PREVIOUS RESEARCH

A preliminary step in planning any investigation is an orientation to the problem through reference to the major contributions contained in previous related research. Developed in the past, valuable information may usually be located.

Much of what is referred to in available literature deals with general working conditions (salaries, teaching schedules, administrative policies, etc.). Kelley and Wilbur stated that when general working conditions are mentioned, it is noted that professional nonteaching duties and functions need to be included with these classified in two categories: (1) those which are mandatory and (2) those which are obligatory. By definition, both mandatory and obligatory duties are "required"; they differ to the extent that mandatory duties are those which are officially requested of or assigned to the teacher, while obligatory duties are those which are not officially assigned, but are nevertheless obligatory.[9]

Garrison suggested, in a 1965-66 study, that key issues and problems be divided into four big areas: (1)

---

[9]Roger Garrison, "The Teacher's Professional Situation," Junior College Journal, XXXIV (March, 1967), 16.

administration and the context in which the teacher works; including salaries, fringe benefits, facilities, equipment, teaching loads, chances for professional growth, and intellectual stimulation; (2) job satisfaction, continued growth and intellectual stimulation on the job, with all the faculty stating over and over again that TIME was a problem; (3) problems of huge enrollments, how to increase efficiency, the teacher's part in filling college goals; and (4) difficulties facing teachers promoted to department chairmenships rapidly, without the proper training and orientation.[10]

There are many variables, as Garrison suggested, but notice must be taken that teaching load appears lost among the "key issues and problems" in his study.

In an attempt to determine faculty attitudes and opinions, Kelley and Wilbur determined a necessity for a definite knowledge of just what (the) faculty wants. Their survey and studies show they want better or improved (1) salaries, (2) teaching loads, (3) free time, (4) working relations with administration, (5) lines of communication, (6) standards of teaching and learning, (7) student follow-up results, (8) counseling and student placement, (9) status and prestige, (10) faculty

---

[10]Garrison, "Teacher's Professional Situation," p. 15.

orientation, (11) opportunities for professional growth, (12) public relations, (13) administrative leadership, (14) quality among the staff, (15) financing, (16) cooperation among staff, (17) articulation and coordination within and between levels, (18) attitudes among students and teachers, (19) methods of teacher evaluation, (20) methods of staffing, (21) agreement on philosophy, goals, purposes, and functions, (22) continuity of learning, (23) faculty voice in college government, (24) freedom from unnecessary pressures, and (25) faculty fringe benefits.[11]

What happens when a group of teachers DO NOT get what they want? Among the possibilities range the "do nothing but complain" attitudes to the extreme of labor organization practices of striking. One instance in 1966-67 found the Cook County College (Chicago City College) Teachers Union to be the "first major two-year college in the nation to achieve the breakthrough to a 12-hour load" following its strike, with the major lesson, that the faculty demand for determination of their working conditions might no longer be ignored. According to Thornton:

---

[11]Kelley and Wilbur, Teaching in the Community Junior College, pp. 214-215.

> Teaching assignments in public community colleges tend to approximate fifteen credit hours of teaching per semester, with some variation between twelve and eighteen credit hours.[12]

When, in 1939, Conley studied the work loads of public junior college instructors, he found five departments (agriculture, art, biological science, engineering, and physical science) in which the teaching load exceeded 20 clock hours. It must be noted that in each of these departments, there is a high ratio of laboratory hours to lecture classes. In six other departments, he found average loads of between 16 and 20 hours weekly (commerce, home economics, mathematics, natural science, physical education, and social science), each of which finds it "usual for the scheduled weekly hours to exceed the credit value." In the remaining four departments (education, English, languages, and music), 15 hours per week or less were spent in the classroom.[13]

In addition, Conley discovered that the average time devoted each week to instructional duties amounts to thirty-five hours, almost equally divided between

---

[12]The use of credit hours as a basis of computing load will lead to variations in the number of classroom hours per week required of instructors in different disciplines.
Thornton, The Community Junior College, p. 138.

[13]Ibid., pp. 138-139.

classroom and nonclassroom instructional duties. To this, thirty-five hours must be added more than eighteen hours per week that instructors spend in other duties--student activities, committee work, administration, and miscellaneous. The total of fifty-one hours of professional activity weekly is not out of line with the findings of others investigating similar situations.[14]

Hillway summarized the situation as follows: "Fifteen hours in the classroom, fifteen hours in lesson preparation, and fifteen hours in conferences, community meetings, and similar activities."[15]

An additional factor, yet unmentioned, is the number of different class preparations required--especially in unrelated subject fields. Koos, after reporting on class preparations of 1458 instructors in 48 community colleges, recommended that instructors be equipped to teach more broadly than in a single subject." He found that 45 percent of his respondents taught in a single subject field, 36 percent in two fields, 13 percent in three, and 6 percent in four or more fields. Although most teach only

---

[14]William H. Conley, "The Junior College Instructor," Junior College Journal, IX (May, 1939), 509.

[15]Tyrus Hillway, The American Two-year College (New York: Harper and Row, 1958), p. 200.

in major and minor subjects fields, one out of five (19 percent) must, on occasion, be expected to teach in one or two additional fields.[16]

In 1958, fifty-one California community colleges reported that they expected NO preparations other than the major or minor field.[17]

SUMMARY

The findings derived from relevant related literature were limited. A library search failed to produce adequate information so an ERIC search was initiated using appropriate terms: community college teaching load, junior college teaching load, clock hours, community college teaching assignment. This still did not produce any relevant data.

The available literature substantiated the need for the study in several ways. Early studies produced varying expectations of faculty teaching load, many of which are yet unchanged.

Key issues and problems of general working

---

[16]Leonard V. Koos, "Junior College Teachers: Subjects Taught and Specialized Preparations," Junior College Journal, XVIII (December, 1947), 203.

[17]Thornton, The Community Junior College, p. 139.

conditions "lose" the problem of teaching load or clock hours assigned, and the importance of each to the faculty, among other necessities.

Faculty does rank teaching load high on the list of need and expectation in communication with administration.

Chapter 3

THE PROCEDURE

To effect this study, "Analysis of California Community College District Policies of Faculty Teaching Load," two basic procedures were used: (1) a review of related literature and (2) a survey. The study necessitated the development of a survey: a state-wide survey of class scheduling standards at each of the 102 California community colleges.

This chapter deals with an overview of the community college concept and a description of the population studies, selection of the control group, and the development of the questionnaire.

SELECTION OF CONTROL GROUP STUDIED

The California community college assigned teaching loads are generally prescribed by the district policy of each. According to the district involved, requirements for assignment of faculty as to teaching differ. Instructors are generally assigned varying teaching clock hours. The procedures of assignment vary, but generally are determined in comparison with academic clock hour

assignments.

POPULATION INFORMATION

The population for this study was composed of the 102 California community colleges and policies followed for teacher assignment in each. The California community college system is widely situated throughout the state with 66 institutions in the southern portion and 36 in the northern area (San Francisco and above). The system spans the state for nearly 800 miles, from Weed in the north to San Diego in the south. The principal function of the system is to provide an "open door" policy of post-high-school education for all.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The principal source of information for this study was a questionnaire. This instrument was designed with the purpose of providing a sound basis for future research, as well as improvement in teacher teaching load assignments.

It was decided that the most effective instrument for securing a variety of data from 102 sources was a written questionnaire. The information afforded a consistent presentation to the respondent, and the data could be recorded in a manner which simplified tabulation. The guidelines for the formulation of questions were

by the following criteria:

1. The answering of questions would require a minimum of effort.

2. The questions were primarily designed to gather information about faculty teaching load, in relation to clock hours.

3. The questions were gathered to collect data about selected disciplines.

4. The answers to questions would be reported in a way amenable to accurate computation, analysis, and interpretation.

5. The wording of the questions must be easily understood by all respondents.

According to the above criteria, the questions were constructed to college information regarding the following:

"Are 'standard teaching loads' equated to lecture hours per week?" _____

If answer was yes, what number of hours is the guideline based upon? _____

Range or average clock hours per week for:

1. Occupational education instructors
2. Physical education instructors
3. Business instructors
4. Instructors who have laboratory, studio, performance, or other classes which are not considered lecture in nature.

(In lecture/nonlecture combination loads, are the nonlecture hours computed in proportion to lecture hours? _____

If so, what is the ratio used? _____)

5. Instructors having English composition classes

6. Foreign language instructors

7. Other academic instructors

8. Physical science instructors hours in lecture. Are additional laboratory hours required? _____

Are instructors assigned more than two lecture hours consecutively without consent? _____

Are instructors expected to be on campus more than seven (7) hours in any one day? _____

Are instructors assigned more than three (3) classes requiring different preparations? _____

If it is necessary to assign an instructor a heavier than normal schedule in one semester, is the schedule of the instructor reduced proportionately the following semester? _____

If so, how? _____

From the above information, the questionnaire was developed (see Appendix A).

ADMINISTRATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

After construction of the questionnaire, the instrument was mailed, together with a self-addressed, stamped return envelope to each of the 102 community colleges in California. Each was specifically addressed to the dean of instruction and/or occupational education. Returns were tabulated as they were received. In the organization of the questionnaire, other areas of responsibility (instructor teaching assignments) were mentioned as to clock hours required of instructors in each to determine whether a "standard teaching load" was being followed by individual districts contacted.

A personal follow-up letter urging cooperation in the study was addressed to those deans who did not respond to the first request (see Appendix B), and duplicate questionnaires, cover letters, and return envelopes were provided.

Each included the offer of a return of data gathered, should the respondent so desire (see Appendix C).

Colleges having respondents to the questionnaire are listed in Appendix D.

SUMMARY

The description of basic procedures used in the development of the study dealt with: (1) a description of the population studied, (2) selection of the control group, as well as (3) construction of the questionnaire.

At the time of the study, there were 102 community colleges in California, many with differing policies as to requirements for faculty assignment. Each of the colleges was surveyed with a written questionnaire, planned to provide responses to various data selected in relation to faculty teaching load.

Following construction of the questionnaire, the instrument was mailed, along with a self-addressed, stamped return envelope, to each California community college. A personal follow-up letter was directed to those deans who did not respond within reasonable amount of time to the first request. The second request included duplicate questionnaires, cover letters, and return envelopes.

For those desiring data collected, a response was solicited in the questionnaire.

Chapter 4

RESULTS

The first three chapters were concerned with the statement of the problem and its importance, a review of literature, and a presentation of the procedures utilized in conducting the investigation.

This chapter reports the results of the survey of faculty teaching loads, additional assignments, and other related information. The procedures used in conducting the survey were described in Chapter 3. Reported here are the findings from 73 replies from California community colleges returning questionnaires. This represented a 72 percent return, which was considered to be an adequate sample.

So that all the respondents would have the same frame of reference for answering the questionnaire, the term "standard teaching load" as equated to lecture hours per week was used.

To facilitate analysis of the data, structured responses were asked for to ensure comparability, but several items allowed open-ended responses to obtain maximum detail and comment. The instrument was divided

into sections based on each instructional discipline for clarity of response.

STANDARD TEACHING LOAD

As a method of determining the number of colleges surveyed that were engaged in following standard teaching load as a guideline, the instrument inquired as to whether or not standard teaching load was equated to lecture hours per week. Of the respondents, 48, or 65.8 percent, reported that this was the policy generally used; 9, or 12.3 percent, reported that this was not so at the particular institution; and 16, or 21.9 percent, gave no response to this question. Upon further examination of the 57 respondents who stated that standard teaching load was a policy adhered to; it was noted that of the 57, 52, or 89.5 percent, DID follow the fourteen or fifteen clock hour scheduling as a guideline (see Table 1 for distribution of the remainder of the respondents, all amounts negligible).

Occupational Education Instructors

Replies indicated that the area of occupational education was one of the least consistent in assignment of faculty clock hours. Clock hours reported ranged from fourteen to thirty-five hours per week, and many areas

Table 1

Standard Teaching Load (N = 57)

Total clock hours	Number of respondents	Percent of response
14 or 15	51	89.5
15 to 17	2	3.5
18 to 20	2	3.5
21 to 24	2	3.5

overlapped in assignment. Since each occupational program necessitates varied scheduling, the responses clearly indicated that there was no clearly defined pattern.

Of the participating colleges, 3, or 4.1 percent, reported clock hours assigned in the range from fourteen to thirty-five per week, and was noted as a special case due to the wide range possible at those institutions. Seven, or 9.6 percent, reported a range from fifteen to eighteen hours; while 36, or 49.3 percent, reported their assignments in the range of eighteen to twenty-four hours; 8, or 10.9 percent, noted a range from twenty to twenty-four hours; 5, or 6.9 percent, reported from twenty to thirty clock hours; and 4, or 5.5 percent, gave no answer to the question.

In recording returned data regarding physical education instructors, it was noted that there was a great overlap of assigned hours, and the information was recorded in Table 2, since the variations formed a significant differential in expectation of faculty teaching load. The highest percentage noted was the group of thirty respondents that formed 41.2 percent of the group responding and placed their faculty in the twenty to twenty-four hour scheduling of clock hours.

Table 2

Physical Education Instructors (N = 73)

Total clock hours	Number of respondents	Percent of response
14 to 18	4	5.6
15 to 22*	8	11.0
18 to 21	16	21.9
20 to 24	30	41.2
24 to 28	5	6.8
29 and over	1	1.2
No response	9	12.3

*Overlap of hours

Faculty load for business education instructors formed an area of response that is significant with 40, or 54.8 percent, of instructors expected to teach fifteen to eighteen clock hours while an additional 20, or 27.4 percent, assigned to eighteen to twenty-one clock hours, with some of the larger number assigned in "practical observation" according to notes included in respondents' replies.

Table 3

Business Education Instructors (N = 73)

Total clock hours	Number of respondents	Percent of response
8 to 15	1	1.4
15 to 18	40	54.8
18 to 21	20	27.4
21 to 24	3	4.1
No response	9	12.3

Responses regarding teaching hours for instructors who have laboratory, studio, etc., were less clearly defined. Table 4 presents notes regarding overlap in expectation of hours spent.

Table 4

Clock Hours Stated as Guideline for Instructors Who Have Laboratory, Studio, Performance, or Other Classes Which Are NOT Considered Lecture in Nature (N = 73)

Total clock hours	Number of respondents	Percent of response
15 to 20	11	15.0
18 to 24	26	35.6
20 to 25*	21	28.8
25 and above	2	2.8
No response	13	17.8

*Note overlap in hours

Lecture/Nonlecture Combination Loads

The questionnaire requested specific information regarding lecture/nonlecture combination teaching loads: (1) Are the nonlecture hours computed in proportion to lecture hours? (2) If so, what is the ratio used?

Sixty, or 82.8 percent, of the total 73 questionnaire respondents answered the question. Of those responding, 48, or 80.0 percent, reported in the affirmative; and 12, or 20.0 percent, reported that nonlecture hours were not computed in proportion to lecture hours.

Lack of response to this question seemed to indicate a basic indifference to this need for an established ratio. Table 5 illustrates some of the differences in ratio used in response to Question 2.

Table 5

Ratio Used in Computation of Lecture/Nonlecture and/or Laboratory Hours (N = 48)

Ratio used--hourly	Number of respondents	Percent of response
1 lecture to 1 lab*	1	2.1
1 lecture to 2 labs	6	12.5
1 lecture to 3 labs	4	8.3
2 lectures to 3 labs	16	33.3
3 lectures to 4 labs	8	16.7
15 hours lecture and 20 hours lab**	2	4.2
15 hours lecture and 25 hours lab**	4	8.3
Individually determined, "varies" according to subject matter	7	14.6

*This is a special case as assigned load MUST meet 18-hour load requirement.

**Each noted that this time was "partially spent in supervising teaching assistants, NOT actual teaching load."

Instructors conducting English composition were categorized into two significant areas with 40, or 54.7 percent, expected to spend fifteen to seventeen clock hours in the classroom; and 23, or 31.5 percent, assigned to twelve to fourteen hours (see Table 6 for further data).

Table 6

Instructors Conducting English Composition Classes (N = 73)

Total clock hours	Number of respondents	Percent of response
12 to 14	23	31.5
15 to 17	40	54.7
18 to 21	2	2.8
22 to 24	2	2.8
No response	6	8.2

It is notable that foreign language instructors followed a more definite pattern with 54, or 74.0 percent, of the total respondents assigned to fifteen to eighteen clock hours (see Table 7).

The MOST clearly defined pattern of assignments is that which includes the "other academic faculty," not mentioned thus far in the study. The assignments for this group found 65, or 89.1 percent, of the respondents

Table 7

Scheduling for Foreign Language Instructors
(N = 73)

Total clock hours	Number of respondents	Percent of response
12 to 14	2	2.8
15 to 18	54	74.0
18 to 22	12	16.4
22 and above	1	1.4
No response	4	5.4

assigned to the fifteen to twenty hours scheduling (see Table 8 for additional data).

Less than one half of the physical science instructors are included in the largest group able to be categorized. Thirty-three, or 45.2 percent, are expected to spend fifteen to eighteen clock hours in the classroom. Table 9 notes additional assignments required for some teachers in this discipline.

Physical Science Instructors

Of the institutions responding to the question regarding the requirement that physical science instructors are assigned laboratory time, 26, or 35.6 percent, of the total respondents (73) replied in the affirmative. In

Table 8

Present Assigned Clock Hours for Other Academic Faculty not Included in Study thus Far (N = 73)

Total clock hours	Number of respondents	Percent of response
12 to 14	2	2.7
15 to 20	65	89.1
24 and above	2	2.7
No response	4	5.5

Table 9

Physical Science Instructors (N = 73)

Total clock hours	Number of respondents	Percent of response
3 to 8	8	11.0
9 to 12	12	16.4
15 to 18	33	45.2
18 to 24	8	11.0
No response	12	16.4

Note.--Further assigned hours in some institutions for laboratory hours required are indicated later in the text.

to lecture hours; 5, or 19.2 percent, are assigned to laboratory sessions of three to five hours; and 14, or 53.8 percent, of six to nine hours; and 7, or 27.0 percent, must spend ten to eighteen additional assigned hours.

Instructor assignment of more than two consecutive lecture hours. As stated, it was felt to be a necessary part of this survey to determine additional data regarding faculty scheduling. When the question was included in the survey as to whether instructors were assigned more than two consecutive lecture hours without consent, the respondents stated that 33, or 45.3 percent, ARE; 35, or 47.9 percent, ARE NOT; and 2, or 2.7 percent, "sometimes are given such assignments"; with 3 giving no answer to the question.

Requirement that instructors remain on campus more than seven hours each day. Additional instructor time commitments presented the need to seek response to the question, "Are instructors expected to be on campus more than seven hours in any one day?" Of those institutions replying to the question, only 8 replied in the affirmative; 59 responded negatively; with 6 declining to answer the question.

Assignment of instructors to more than three different preparations. When presented with the question regarding the assignment of teachers to more than three preparations, of the respondents (73), 50, or 68.5 percent, replied affirmatively; 17, or 23.2 percent, responded in the negative; with 2, or 2.8 percent, stating "seldom done"; and 4, or 5.5 percent, not answering.

Additional faculty assignment. When it is occasionally necessary to assign an instructor to a heavy schedule in one semester, is the schedule of the instructor reduced proportionately the following semester? Of the answers received from the total group of respondents, 69 responded affirmatively, with 4 replying that the schedule was NOT reduced.

Of the 69 replying that the schedule was adjusted or reduced in the case of an overload, each was requested to include the method used to adequately compensate the instructor. Table 10 provides the respondents' replies.

AVAILABILITY OF SURVEY DATA TO RESPONDENTS

Respondents were provided with the opportunity to request survey results with the following results: 45, or 61.7 percent, stated that they would want them when available; 17, or 23.3 percent, replied negatively; with 11, or 15.0 percent, supplying no response. Method of

response is shown in Appendix C.

Table 10

Adjusted (or Reduced) Instructor Schedule to Compensate for Heavy Course Load Indicating Methods Used by Respondents (N = 69)

Number of respondents	Percent of respondents	Method
7	10.2	Reduction in hours the following semester/quarter
6	8.7	Monetary compensation using hourly base
26	37.7	Future hours equated and/or averaged
1	1.4	Release time
4	5.8	Mutual agreement with division chairman or dean prior
25	36.2	Method not stated, just noted that it was done

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to survey the presently functioning faculty teaching assignments within the California community college system in order to determine if a standard guideline was in existence.

Teaching hours assigned to community college faculty directly influence faculty attitudes. Variables in assignments present areas of conflict in relationships with those in other disciplines. Leaders who assign clock hours are many times unaware that academic instructors feel that their study time is limited, while occupational education instructors find themselves equally limited for time to enable them to keep their educational presentations current with industry advances, new methods of production, and/or advances in technology.

At the present time, each district surveyed appears to act on an autonomous basis, as shown in the variables in results gleaned from the survey responses. Suggestions in literature imply a fifteen-clock hour load to be the

optimum, and the California chancellor's office supports this, however, many deviations from this were found in compilation of results.

It was noted that in disciplines such as English, foreign language, and other academic areas, that faculty had more clearly defined patterns of assignment, with English, foreign language, and most physical science instructors assigned from fifteen to seventeen or eighteen hours; and other academic areas given fifteen to twenty hours as a general expectation.

In the area of occupational education instructor assignment, the most inconsistencies were found, with hours ranging from fourteen to thirty-five hours per week, and many areas overlapping in assignment. Not quite one half of the respondents reported from fifteen to twenty-four hours, but this is not enough to establish a definite pattern due to many varying responses in smaller percentages.

Physical education instructors, in spite of a few overlapping situations, maintained a range in the area of eighteen to twenty-four hours.

Other responsibilities, such as lecture/nonlecture and/or laboratory hours brought varying responses, each requiring in-depth evaluation of individual scheduling, caused for the most part by varying ratio computation

methodology.

CONCLUSIONS

A review of the literature and an analysis of the results of the survey conducted led to the following conclusions:

1. The most efficient scheduling of each skilled faculty member should be expedited throughout the California community college system in order to best use the teaching time of staff members.

2. If the administration and faculty are unable to devote the requisite time to planning scheduling, the educational quality will suffer.

3. The philosophies of college administrative personnel determines the extent to which the changes necessary may be made.

4. Thorough and effective planning is a necessary process in the development of the college program to effectively meet the educational needs of those to be served.

5. While considerable differences exist in the types of programs offered at the community college level, each should be carefully scheduled with full instructor consent, so that total instructor potential may be utilized.

RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the findings and conclusions of this study, the following recommendations are made:

1. State agencies and both academic and occupational education departments should establish realistic proposals of expected teaching loads and make an attempt to effect any changes in the existing system for their establishment.

2. Continuous assessment should be done regarding correlation of faculty teaching loads in each discipline.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bogue, Jesse P. The Community College. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1950.

Conley, William H. "The Junior College Instructor," Junior College Journal, IX (May, 1939), 507-512.

Garrison, Roger. "The Teacher's Professional Situation," Junior College Journal, XXXIV (March, 1967), 15-18.

Hillway, Tyrus. The American Two-year College. New York: Harper and Row, 1958.

Kelley, Win, and Leslie Wilbur. Teaching in the Community Junior College. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970.

Koos, Leonard V. "Junior College Teachers: Subjects Taught and Specialized Preparations," Junior College Journal, XVIII (December, 1947), 196-209.

Simms, Charles Wesley. The Present Legal Status of the Public Junior College. Nashville, Tenn.: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1948.

Thornton, James W., Jr. The Community Junior College. 2d ed. New York: James Wiley, 1966.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

GLENDALE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

May 15, 1975

As an Occupational Education faculty member of this institution, conducting an independent survey of class scheduling standards in California Community Colleges, I would appreciate your response to the following questions:

Is your "standard teaching load" equated to lecture hours per week? yes_____ no_____ If answer was yes, what number of hours is the guideline based upon? _____

Please fill in the areas left blank for reply in the remaining areas.

1. Occupational education instructors have a range of _____ to _____ per week.
2. Physical education instructors normally have _____clock hours per week.
3. Business instructors average _____ hours per week.
4. Instructors who have laboratory, studio, performance, or other classes which are not considered lecture in nature, usually teach _____ hours per week.
   In lecture/non-lecture combination loads, are the non-lecture hours computed in proportion to lecture hours? yes _____ no_____
   If so, what is the ratio used? _____
5. Instructors having English composition classes average _____ hours per week.
6. Foreign language instructors average _____ hours each semester.
7. Other academic instructors average _____ hours each semester.
8. Physical science instructors average _____ hours in lecture. Additional laboratory hours of _____ are required.

Are instructors assigned more than two lecture hours consecutively without consent? yes _____ no _____

Are instructors expected to be on campus more than seven (7) hours in any one day? yes _____ no _____

Are instructors assigned more than three (3) classes requiring different preparations? yes _____ no _____

If it is necessary to assign an instructor a heavier than normal schedule in one semester, is the schedule of the instructor reduced proportionately the following semester? yes _____ no _____ If so, how? _____
_____.

Results of this survey will be provided upon request. If you so desire, please check here _____, noting your name.
Thank you for your participation.

Very truly yours,

Frances F. Shaw
Assistant Professor
Glendale College

1500 NORTH VERDUGO ROAD, GLENDALE, CALIFORNIA 91208 (213) 240-1000

APPENDIX B

FOLLOW-UP LETTER

GLENDALE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

As yet, I have not received your response to the survey regarding class scheduling standards. As I mentioned in the first mailing, results of the survey will be provided if you so desire, hopefully the data will be helpful to you.

Thank you very much for your time spent in completing the questionnaire, it is much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Frances F. Shaw
Assistant Professor
Glendale College

1500 NORTH VERDUGO ROAD, GLENDALE, CALIFORNIA 91208 (213) 240-1000

APPENDIX C

METHOD OF RESPONSE

Upon completion of the recent survey on class scheduling standards in California community colleges, it was found that the following figures established a norm.

The "standard teaching load" is _____ is not _____ equated to lecture hours per week.

(Number of hours the guideline is based upon _____.)

1. Occupational education instructors have a range of _____ to _____ per week.
2. Physical education instructors normally have _____ hours per week.
3. Business instructors average _____ per week.
4. Instructors who have laboratory, studio, performance, or other classes which are not considered lecture in nature, usually teach _____ hours per week.

   In lecture/nonlecture combination loads, the nonlecture hours are _____ are not _____ computed in proportion to lecture hours. (Ratio used _____.)

5. Instructors having English composition classes average _____ hours per week.
6. Foreign language instructors average _____ hours each semester.
7. Other academic instructors average _____ hours each semester.
8. Physical science instructors average _____ hours in lecture. Additional laboatory hours of _____ are required.

Instructors are _____ are not _____ assigned two lecture hours consecutively without consent.

Instructors are _____ are not _____ expected to be on campus more than seven hours in any one day.

Instructors are _____ are not _____ assigned more than three classes requiring different preparations.

If it is necessary to assign an instructor a heavier than normal schedule in one semester, the schedule of the instructor is _____ is not _____ reduced proportionately the following semester.

How? _____

_____

Your interest in the survey was appreciated. I hope that the data will be beneficial to your program.

Thank you for your participation.

Very truly yours,

Frances F. Shaw,
Assistant professor,
Glendale College

APPENDIX D

RESPONDENTS TO QUESTIONNAIRE

RESPONDENTS TO QUESTIONNAIRE

American River College
4700 College Oak Drive
Sacramento 95841

Antelope Valley College
3041 West Avenue K
Lancaster 93534

Bakersfield College
1801 Panorama Drive
Bakersfield 93305

Barstow Community College
2700 Barstow Road
Barstow 92311

Butte College
Route 1, Box 183A
Oroville 95965

Cabrillo College
6500 Soquel Drive
Aptos 95003

Canada College
4200 Farm Hill Boulevard
Redwood City 94061

Canyons, College of the
25000 West Valencia Boulevard
Valencia 91355

Cerritos College
11110 East Alondra Boulevard
Norwalk 90650

Cerro Coso Community College
College Heights Boulevard
Ridgecrest 93555

Chaffey College
5885 Haven Avenue
Alta Loma 91701

Citrus College
18824 East Foothill Blvd.
Azusa 91702

Compton College
1111 East Artesia Blvd.
Compton 90221

Contra Costa College
2600 Mission Bell Drive
San Pablo 94806

Crafton Hills College
11711 Sand Canyon Road
Yucaipa 92399

Cuesta College
P. O. Box J
San Luis Obispo 93406

De Anza College
21250 Stevens Creek Road
Cupertino 95014

Diablo Valley College
321 Golf Club Road
Pleasant Hill 94523

East Los Angeles College
5357 East Brooklyn Avenue
Los Angeles 90022

Evergreen Valley College
860 South Bascom Avenue
San Jose 95128

Fresno City College
1101 East University Avenue
Fresno 93741

Gavilan College
5055 Santa Teresa Blvd.
Gilroy 95020

Glendale Community College
1500 North Verdugo Road
Glendale 91208

Golden West College
15744 Golden West Street
Huntington Beach 92647

Hancock (Allan) College
800 South College Drive
Santa Maria 93454

Hartnell College
156 Homestead Avenue
Salinas 93901

Imperial Valley College
P.O. Box 158
Imperial 92251

Indian Valley Colleges
720 Ignacio Boulevard
Novato 94947

Laney College
900 Fallon Street
Oakland 94607

Los Angeles City College
855 North Vermont Avenue
Los Angeles 90029

Los Angeles Harbor College
1111 Figueroa Place
Wilmington 90744

Los Angeles North San
Fernando Valley College
400 South San Fernando
Mission Boulevard
San Fernando 91340

Los Angeles Pierce College
6201 Winnetka Avenue
Woodland Hills 91364

Los Angeles Southwest College
11514 South Western Avenue
Los Angeles 90047

Los Angeles Trade-Tech College
400 West Washington Boulevard
Los Angeles 90015

Los Angeles Valley College
5800 Fulton Avenue
Van Nuys 91401

Los Medanos College
2700 East Leland
Pittsburg 94565

Mendocino College
P. O. Box 3000
Ukiah 95482

Merced College
3600 M Street
Merced 95340

Merritt College
12500 Campus Drive
Oakland 94619

Miracosta College
One Barnard Drive
Oceanside 92054

Modesto Junior College
435 College Avenue
Modesto 95350

Monterey Peninsula College
908 Fremont
Monterey 93940

Moorpark College
7075 Campus Road
Moorpar 93021

Mt. San Antonio College
1100 North Grand Avenue
Walnut 91789

Mt. San Jacinto College
21-400 Foothill Boulevard
San Jacinto 92383

Napa Valley College
2277 Napa-Vallejo Highway
Napa 94558

North Peralta Community College
5714 Grove Street
Oakland 94609

Orange Coast College
2701 Fairview Road
Costa Mesa 92626

Palo Verde College
811 West Chanslorway
Blythe 92255

Palomar College
1140 West Mission
San Marcos 92069

Porterville College
900 South Main Street
Porterville 93257

Redwoods, College of the
Eureka 95501

Reedley College
995 North Reed Avenue
Reedley 93654

Rio Hondo College
3600 Workman Mill Road
Whittier 90608

Riverside City College
4800 Magnolia Avenue
Riverside 92506

Saddleback College
28000 Marguerite Parkway
Mission Viejo 92675

San Bernardino Valley College
701 South Mt. Vernon Avenue
San Bernardino 92403

San Diego City College
1425 Russ Boulevard
San Diego 92101

San Diego Evening College
3375 Camino Del Rio South
San Diego 92108

San Diego Mesa College
7250 Mesa College Drive
San Diego 92111

San Jose City College
2100 Moorpark Avenue
San Jose 95128

Santa Ana College
17th Street at Bristol
Santa Ana 92706

Santa Rosa Junior College
1501 Mendocino Avenue
Santa Rosa 95401

Shasta College
1065 North Old Oregon Trail
Redding 96001

Sierra College
5000 Rocklin Road
Rocklin 95677

Siskiyous, College of the
800 College Avenue
Weed 96094

Solano College
P. O. Box 246
Suisun Valley Road
Suisun City 94585

Southwestern College
900 Otay Lakes Road
Chula Vista 92010

Victor Valley College
P. O. Drawer 00
Victorville 92392

West Hills College
300 Cherry Lane
Coalinga 93210

West Los Angeles College
4800 Freshman Drive
Culver City 90230

West Valley College
1400 Fruitvale Avenue
Saratoga 95070

Yuba College
2088 North Beale Road
Marysville 95901

Lake Tahoe Community College
District
P. O. Box 14445
South Lake Tahoe 95702

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

FEB 27 1976

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES